



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,419	04/07/2005	Shaul Shapiro	P-7855-US	6711
49443	7590	02/25/2008		
Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP 1500 Broadway 12th Floor New York, NY 10036			EXAMINER DEBROW, JAMES J	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,419	Applicant(s) SHAPIRO, SHAUL	
	Examiner JAMES J. DEBROW	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07 Apr. 2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application files 07 Apr. 2005.
2. Claims 1-31 are pending in this case. Claims 1 is an independent claim.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because Applicant submission of the front page to PCT International application PCT/IL2003/000801 is not a proper abstract. Applicant submission is not in the form of a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and which include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

5. **Claim 8** is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant failed to remove extra text, which is not part of the claim limitation from the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

6. **Claims 24-27 and 31** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not serve as a basis for any other multiple depend claim. A multiple dependent claim must refer in the alternate to only one set of claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

7. Regarding **Claims 2 and 3**, the use of the trademarks, Adobe, Macromedia, Corel, Quark and Autodesk, have been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. **Claims 1 and 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "*Artwork*" in **claim 1** is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "*Artwork*" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Therefore the Examiner defines "Artwork" as being any text or graphic object which can be manipulated.

The term "*described in great detail*" in **claim 5** is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "*described in great detail*" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The Examiner concludes the term "*described in great detail*" as recited in the claim to mean *any amount of detail*.

10. **Regarding claims 2 and 5**, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clark (Pat. No.: US 6,345,244 B1; Filed: May 27, 1998).**

Regarding independent claim 1, Clark discloses *a method of transforming an Artwork, comprising:*

extracting data representing location based objects from a source file of said Artwork (col. 3, lines 25-28; 320 in Fig. 3; Clark discloses a parser-extractor that extracts translatable source segment and its attributes for a source file, and also extracts each corresponding target segment and its attribute from a target file.).

registering said extracted data in a first structured intermediate database (col. 3, lines 42-56; 322 in Fig. 3; 322 in Fig. 3; Clark discloses storing the translatable source segment and its attributes for a source file in a source segment and attributes list and also storing each corresponding target segment and its attribute in a target segment and attributes list.).

transforming said registered data, according to stored instructions (col. 26, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; Clark discloses an aligner which merges translated source segments and their corresponding target segments as well as associated information.).

registering said transformed data in a second intermediate structured database (col. 26, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; col. 28, line 38-col. 29, line 13; Clark discloses an aligner which merges translated source segments and their corresponding target segments as well as associated information and stores the pair in a merged source-target database. Clark also discloses a leveraged source-target database which is formed if there exist legacy files associated with the source files.).

transforming said source file of said Artwork according to said transformed data registered in said second intermediate database to create a target Artwork file (col. 33, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; Clark discloses a translator propagator that propagates the selected translation to appropriate records of target files in the target project (*Artwork file*)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2-10, 12, 15-17, 19-21, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (Pat. No.: US 6,345,244 B1; Filed: May 27, 1998) in view of Badders et al. (Pat. No.: 5,625,798; Filed: Feb. 24, 1994) (hereinafter 'Badders').

Regarding dependent claim 2, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 1, wherein said source files are one of draw-vector graphics programs such as Adobe Illustrator (ai), Adobe Acrobat (pdf), Macromedia Freehand, Corel Draw (cdr).*

Badders teaches *wherein said source files are one of draw-vector graphics programs* (col. 2, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 5-8; Badders teaches CAD software graphics files with additional attribute information relating to each of the components of the drawing. Therefore Badders teach/suggest a draw-vector graphics program.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting

Art Unit: 2176

information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 1, wherein said source files are described in one of Quark Xpress (qxd), Adobe Pagemaker (pm), Adobe Indesign (pdf) or Autodesk AutoCad (dwg;dxf) description file.*

Badders *wherein said source files are described in one of Quark Xpress (qxd), Adobe Pagemaker (pm), Adobe Indesign (pdf) or Autodesk AutoCad (dwg;dxf) description file* (col. 3, lines 18-44; Badders teaches an AutoCAD drawing file is determined according to the standard AutoCAD software.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said source files are described in any page description language that attaches page location to objects described in it* (col. 4, lines 35-48; col. 8, lines 13-17; Clark teaches pointers to a page of an occurrence books in which each page comprises pointers to the same translatable source-segment.).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said source files are rich text files described in great detail objects, their attributes and locations, such as in the extended markup language (XML) and its derivatives and related formats* (col. 7, lines 14-19).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said location based object is expressed in coordinates of a 2D representation medium* (col. 7, lines 14-19; 6B; Clark discloses location based object is expressed in coordinates of a 2D representation medium, e.g. spreadsheet/table database.).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 4, wherein said 2D representation is one of geographical map or technical drawing*.

Badders wherein said 2D representation is one of geographical map or technical drawing (col. 3, lines 18-44; Badders teaches an AutoCAD drawing file is determined according to the standard AutoCAD software, thus a technical drawing.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said location based object is characterized by its appearance, including geometric form, color, line style and print style* (col. 17, lines 19-55; col. 21, lines 13-28; Clark discloses parsing and storing the characteristics of the source and target files.).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 8, wherein said location based object is characterized by identification data including text and numbers* (col. 18, lines 1-13; col. 19, lines 20-26; col. 19, line 66-col. 20, lines 1-63; Clark discloses the parser generates a number to serve as the attribute identifier of the translatable source segment.).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said location based object is characterized by data calculated from its relationship to other objects in the same source file* (col. 3, lines 6-13).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said first structured intermediate database is a tagged text file with sufficient details describing the object so that reconstructing the original file is possible* (col. 3, lines 25-40; col. 12, line 64-col. 13, line 7; Clark discloses tagging syntactical elements to uniquely identify source and target segments.).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein transforming includes changing the text associated with an object, or its attributes, or its location on the page* (col. 26, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; col. 28, line 38-col. 29, line 13; Clark discloses an aligner which merges translated source segments and their corresponding target segments as well as associated information and stores the pair in a merged source-target database.).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said first intermediate database includes additional data from at least one such database previously prepared from other source files* (col. 3, lines 42-56; Clark discloses the parser-extractor may include means for identifying a pre-existing target file corresponding to each source file.).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said first intermediate database includes descriptive data of objects not extracted from said source file* (col. 26, lines 26-37).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said transforming includes changing properties of said objects in the source file according to instructions included in said first intermediate database* (col. 26, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; Clark discloses an aligner which merges translated source

segments and their corresponding target segments as well as associated information and storing the pairs in a merged source-target database.).

Regarding dependent claim 20, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said transforming includes creating new objects in the source file where second intermediate database includes description of objects not extracted from said source file* (col. 26, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; Clark discloses an aligner which merges translated source segments and their corresponding target segments as well as associated information.).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 19, wherein for each object detailed in the second intermediate database a new object is created in the source file* (col. 26, lines 1-14; 330 in Fig. 3; col. 28, line 38-col. 29, line 13; Clark discloses an aligner which merges translated source segments and their corresponding target segments as well as associated information and stores the pair in a merged source-target database. Clark also discloses a leveraged source-target database which is formed if there exist legacy files associated with the source files.).

Regarding dependent claim 26, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 1, wherein objects are added or changed by directly changing said source file*.

Badders teaches *wherein objects are added or changed by directly changing said source file* (col. 5, lines 20-30; Badders teaches editing objects attributes.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 27, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 1, wherein objects are added or changed by causing the originating program to add or change said objects, using software additions to said originating software*.

Badders teaches *wherein objects are added or changed by causing the originating program to add or change said objects, using software additions to said originating software* (col. 5, lines 34-46; col. 6, lines 28-67; Badders teaches CAD software system can automatically extract and provide attribute data to a user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 28, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 27, wherein the changes are done manually by an operator that activates said software additions.*

Badders teaches *wherein the changes are done manually by an operator that activates said software additions* (col. 5, lines 34-46; col. 6, lines 28-67; Badders teaches CAD software system can automatically extract and provide attribute data to a user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 29, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 27, wherein the changes are done automatically by activating said software additions.*

Badders teaches *wherein the changes are done automatically by activating said software additions* (col. 5, lines 34-46; col. 6, lines 28-67; Badders teaches entering components in the CAD system via an input device.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Badder with Clark for the benefit of extracting information relating to each component in a computer aided design drawing (col. 1, lines 38-41).

Regarding dependent claim 30, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein the target file is the same type as the source file* (col. 3, lines 25-31; Clark discloses wherein the target file is the same type as the source file.).

14. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11, 13, 14, 18, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Clark (Pat. No.: US 6,345,244 B1; Filed: May 27, 1998) in view of Yamamoto et al. (Pat. No.: 5,999,182; Filed: May 11, 1998) (hereinafter 'Yamamoto').

Regarding dependent claim 11, Clark discloses *the method according to claim 1, wherein said first structured intermediate database is represented by a tabular structure, including a spreadsheet* (6B; 7A; Clark discloses wherein an intermediate database is represented by a tabular structure.).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 11, wherein said first intermediate database is a spreadsheet and the commands for transforming the objects are spreadsheet commands.*

Yamamoto teaches *wherein said first intermediate database is a spreadsheet and the commands for transforming the objects are spreadsheet commands* (col. 9,

lines 21-28; Table 5; Yamamoto teaches sample drawing stored in an intermediate data file in spreadsheet format.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 13, wherein said spreadsheet manipulation commands are stored in additional related files.*

Yamamoto teaches *wherein said spreadsheet manipulation commands are stored in additional related files* (col. 11, line 40-col. 12, line 59; Yamamoto teaches/suggest spreadsheet manipulation commands are stored in additional related files.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding dependent claim 18, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said objects was given an instruction to be subsequently omitted in said first intermediate database.*

Yamamoto teaches *wherein at least one of said objects was given an instruction to be subsequently omitted in said first intermediate database* (col. 13, lines 3-13; Yamamoto teaches/suggest wherein at least one of said objects was given an instruction to be subsequently omitted in said first intermediate database.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding dependent claim 22, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 21, wherein said objects are arranged in layers, or not arranged in layers, or rearranged in layers, where new objects are put in new layers or put in the original layers*.

Yamamoto teaches *wherein said objects are arranged in layers, or not arranged in layers, or rearranged in layers, where new objects are put in new layers or put in the original layers* (col. 5, lines 1-14; col. 5, lines 1-65; col. 11, lines 9-39; Yamamoto teaches an intermediated data file organized to express type, geometric data, layer and color of a graphic form separately.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 1, wherein the data in said first intermediate database can be manually edited by the user including entering new values in lieu of present values in the file.*

Yamamoto teaches *wherein the data in said first intermediate database can be manually edited by the user including entering new values in lieu of present values in the file* (col. 5, lines 1-65; Yamamoto teaches the edit record includes a graphic form insertion record, an attribute signification and a text insertion record. Thus Yamamoto suggest *wherein the data in said first intermediate database can be manually edited by the user including entering new values in lieu of present values in the file.*).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 23, wherein said manual changes can be applied to the original extracted version of said database or a manipulated version.*

Yamamoto teaches *wherein said manual changes can be applied to the original extracted version of said database or a manipulated version* (col. 5, lines 1-65; Yamamoto teaches the edit record includes a graphic form insertion record, an

attribute signification and a text insertion record. Thus Yamamoto suggests manual changes can be applied to the original extracted version of said database or a manipulated version.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding dependent claim 25, Clark does not expressly disclose *the method according to claim 24, wherein said spreadsheet manipulations can be applied to the original extracted version of said database or a manipulated version.*

Yamamoto teaches *wherein said spreadsheet manipulations can be applied to the original extracted version of said database or a manipulated version* (col. 11, lines 9-55; Yamamoto suggest spreadsheet manipulations can be applied to the original extracted version of said database.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yamamoto with Clark for the benefit of providing a graphic data conversion method for converting graphic data of a first format of a drawing into a second format different from the first (col. 2, lines 31-35).

16. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. **Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (Pat. No.: US 6,345,244 B1; Filed: May 27, 1998) in view of Carbonell et al. (Pat. No.: 5,625,798; Filed: Feb. 24, 1994) (hereinafter 'Carbonell').**

Regarding dependent claim 31, lark does not expressly disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein the type of target file different than the source file.

Carbonell teaches wherein the type of target file different than the source file (col. 5, lines 21-37; col. 6, lines 39-48; Carbonell teaches a machine translation function that transform the document into a language-independent form called Interlingua and then generates translations from Interlingua text. The Interlingua text is in a form that can be translated to multiple target languages. Therefore, Carbonell teaches wherein the type of target file different than the source file.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Carbonell with Clark for the benefit of providing a machine translation function that transforms document text into a language-independent form (col. 5, lines 26-30).

19. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

/William L. Bashore/
William L. Bashore/
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100